

DRAFT

Standards Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: December 9, 1997

Attending: Belinda Collins (OSS/TS) Chair, Stephen Carpenter (OIAA), Bill Cleveland for William Koch (CSTL), Lanse Felker (OQP), John Mayo-Wells (EEEL), Al Parr (PL), George Quinn (MSEL), Mike Hogan and Carroll Croarkin (ITL), Simone Yaniv for Howard Bloom (MEL), Joel Zingeser (BFRL), **OSS staff:** Christine DeVaux, Krista Johnsen Leuteritz, Joanne Overman, Joan Tyler. **SAC members absent:** Cita Furlani (ATP), Roger Kilmer (MEP), and Albert Lee (Program Office).

Handouts for attendees included: 1) Agenda; 2) SAMI database breakout of NIST participants in the ISO and IEC; 3) Outline of Publication on NIST Standards Success Stories; 4) NIST International Activities, special pub 915; 5) NISTIR 6077, "The U.S. Certification System from a Governmental Perspective" and 6) a brochure describing NCSCI. The following were agenda topics:

1. Open Meeting and Introductions (Collins)
2. Tour of National Center for Standards and Certification Information, NCSCI (Overman)
3. Approval of minutes of previous meeting on October 1, 1997 (Tyler)
4. Discussion on a structure for "fees/dues" for Standards Participation (Collins)
5. Update on Strategic Standards Management at NIST (Collins)
6. Update on gathering success stories of standards development at NIST, results to be published as a NIST-wide document (Tyler)
7. Update on Standards Assistance and Management Information (SAMI) Database activity (Overman)
8. Report on Lab Standards Activities and policy issues, etc. (OU's)
9. Scheduling date for next meeting (Collins)
10. Adjournment (Collins)

Belinda Collins opened the meeting with introductions. Joel Zingeser of BFRL introduced a special visitor from Japan. Then, JoAnne Overman provided the group with a tour of the National Center for Standards and Certification Information (NCSCI) which is located on the first floor of NIST North. JoAnne described the Center's capabilities and demonstrated the National Standards Systems Network (NSSN). JoAnne said that negotiations were underway to make the NSSN available campus-wide in the very near future. Belinda pointed out that the NSSN service is the result of a partnership between ANSI and NIST. JoAnne stressed the availability of NCSCI *to all* of NIST for any standards-related information.

Approval of October Meeting Minutes

There were no additional changes to the October minutes. Joan Tyler stated that she had already amended the October minutes with changes suggested by Joel Zingeser, relative to comments that he had made at the last meeting. Note: comments to the minutes are welcome, so please do not hesitate to call it to the attention of the secretary if you see that changes are needed.

Discussion on Structure for “fees/dues” for Standards Participation (Collins)

Mike Hogan led off the discussion by explaining the International Program Fee (IPF) system of ANSI for operating ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariats by ANSI. He said the IPF is \$300.00/ per person on an annual basis for participating in a US TAG for a JTC 1 project, working group, or subcommittee. The IPF covers both the principal and alternate representative for groups where membership is organizational. He also pointed out that ANSI had been spending about \$1 million/year on processing paper documents for JTC 1. ANSI has been able to drastically reduce these costs by switching to electronic document processing.

Mike went on to say that, starting in 1998, the fee for participating on the ANSI Information Systems Standards Board (ISSB) was \$700/year in order to keep the board in operation. Previously, ANSI covered the administrative costs of operating the ISSB.

Belinda Collins stated that ANSI pays \$2 million as dues for participation in ISO and IEC, and that federal agencies are paying \$1,000/year to ANSI. Belinda went on to say that government agencies are *not* paying their fair share, but it is not clear how to manage a transition to a more equitable structure. There is a sense that many individuals are suddenly getting bills they don't understand.

Al Parr pointed out that it appears that NIST gets little economic benefit (or payback) from its standards activities, and asked what is the fair share for its efforts. He went on to say that other governments subsidize the work on standards activities. Al also pointed out that many technical divisions within NIST get little or no budget allocations for standards activities.

Joel Zingeser thought it would be a good idea to ask ANSI to show us how they budget their money. What are ANSI dues, frameworks, does anyone here at NIST have this information? (Belinda will provide an overview of the ANSI budget for the SAC). Joel also pointed out that the game is different today than before - the role of standards (according to the Director) is a higher priority today than previously because of the importance of international trade.

John Mayo-Wells asked if the Standards Assistance and Management Information (SAMI) project could be made available on-line? Belinda Collins stated that putting the database on line is on the “to

do” list, but due to the heavy workload of the OSS computer staff, she is unsure when the work will be completed. JoAnne Overman stated that she has a contractor working on this who should have something available in mid-1998.

Mike Hogan pointed out that the paper copy (form 83) is still important so that Division Chiefs and for others higher in the management chain to know who is participating, and so management is in the decision-making/approval loop for standards participation. Mike also said that sometimes there is confusion with form 83 when the principal participant fills out the form one way *then* the alternate fills it out a different way.

The question also came up about the possibility of legal ramifications associated with NIST having paid dues to standards organizations.

Other questions came up about the voting process of NIST representatives when standards come up for ballot. It was felt that perhaps NIST management should be in the review loop to look at cross-cutting policy issues. SAC members discussed possible procedures and policy for internal review of standards documents. It was pointed out by Simone Yaniv that tight deadlines for decision-making on the part of the standards representative do not always allow for special review and comment by others, since sometimes the window for response is only a few days. On the voting issue, it was pointed out that no matter how strong and independent one may feel about an issue, in reality, at voting time, “the individual is voting for NIST.” The point was also made that in the future, it may be necessary to establish some sort of review process. Perhaps a mechanism similar to the WERB review process would be appropriate. Because standards have been elevated in importance (via both the Director and the NTTA), it may be time to consider a review process.

During the discussion, it was pointed out that perhaps the internal internet could be used for OU’s to distribute ballot and voting information internally. The internet could be used as a tool to alert others when critical standards were coming up for review, and to alert management on voting decisions, etc. The internet or intranets could be used to inform others across campus about standards activities by subject areas in order to facilitate communications among subject matter experts who are concerned with standards.

Update on Strategic Standards Management (SSM) at NIST (Collins)

Belinda pointed out that the discussions thus far today had implications for SSM and would be used as input, and that developing a strategy for managing standards at NIST is an on-going process for both OSS and SAC. The question was asked about the linkage to a strategic plan for international issues (SPIRE). Belinda said she had given a talk to the VCAT on standards in international trade (viewgraphs are attached). She also said she would investigate the linkage to SPIRE and report back to the committee.

Update -Gathering Success Stories of Standards Development Activities at NIST (Tyler)

Joan reported that an outline has been developed (see handout) for the publication which contains a section for each OU to provide its significant standards activities. She said she had been researching the “Update” archives for significant information about standards as well as publications such as the “Guide to NIST” and various other input to create the draft. The draft will need review and input from each OU. The target for publication is the Spring of 1998.

To complete the OU standards activity, the following information is needed:

1. the name of the person responsible for the work
2. the standards development organization(s) providing the forum
3. what impacts or benefits gained from developing the standard
4. significant emerging standards (those in process)

Update on Standards Information Program (JoAnne Overman)

JoAnne Overman reported that James Rountree is currently working on the SAMI annual report. Plans are to put the publication on-line and make it easily accessible during the first half of 1998.

Plans include the following:

1. On-line updates to the database (form 83 would be on-line)
2. Searches by keyword, person and title
3. Approvals by Division Chiefs (to maintain a record)

Report on Standards Activities in the OU's (SAC Members)

ITL - Mike Hogan reported that his laboratory is reaching out to all the OU's to establish priorities. ITL has formed a NIST-wide task group to develop and improve the current IT process, and is working closely with MEL in these efforts.

OQP - Lanse Felker reported that the Baldrige office now has “real” criteria for the healthcare and education categories which will be available in January of 1998. The 1998 criteria for businesses is currently available. The “Quest for Excellence” conference is scheduled on February 9-11 with a gala celebration commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Baldrige Award on February 8.

MSEL - George Quinn asked if an MOU existed between NIST and AIST/MITI. Carpenter of OIAA stated that if TA had forwarded an MOU to NIST, it would be listed on the OIAA homepage. Belinda Collins gave the action item to Christine Devaux (a specialist in Asian affairs in OSS's Global Systems Program) to research.

PL - Al Parr reported that the laboratories are ISO Guide 25 compliant.

EEEL - John Mayo-Wells reported that EEEL has spent some time recently examining the EMC (electromagnetic compatibility) sector of the United States-European Union

Mutual Recognition Agreement. Our goal is to determine if NIST measurement services and capabilities are adequate to support the EMC sector at the level of a national measurement institute.

BFRL - Joel Zingesser reported that the meetings scheduled with Saudi Arabia have now been rescheduled for February 98, and the symposium for Caribbean and Central America has been moved to April of 1998. He also said that there is a major meeting on Thursday (11th) of this week at HUD to roll out a multi-agency partnership program for advancing technologies in housing. The activity is chaired by Secretary Como of HUD.

Discussion of Establishing Time for Meetings

After discussion, it was decided that meetings would take place bi-monthly and more often if there was a need.

Another subject: John Mayo-Wells said that as a member of the Centennial Committee, he would like to see the SAC included, even though the activity was a bit in the future. Belinda pointed out that OSS has proposed a celebration of Standards as part of the activities. Krista Johnsen Leuteritz will be working on this activity for OSS.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for February 5th from 2:00 - 4:00 pm.

Action Items:

Christine Devaux

- Provide answer to the question "if NIST or ITA has a MOU with AIST/MITI?"

Heydemann

- contact Matt Heyman about reviving the idea of a monthly or bi-monthly NIST publication highlighting standards activities (replacing "Dimensions")

Krista Johnsen Leuteritz

- Work with Centennial Committee relative to SAC input
- Provide framework for strategic standards management plan at NIST for consideration by SAC members (estimated completion March 1998)

Overman

- put Access database on-line. Estimated completion 1/98.
- put NIST Form 83 on-line
- contact Kevin Brady to find out if updates to NIST employee participation in SDO's can be made electronically

Tyler

- Contact the program office about GEMS (for possible input for Success Stories)
- contact OU/SAC members about their work with States or get state contacts (on-going)
- ask Carpenter to address a future SAC meeting about the questions of international standards activities

- develop a list of 6 or 7 items stating why NIST employees should be involved in standards activities (on-going)
- develop and publish success stories (or failures) about standards development as a NIST-IR, using Technical Highlights and the Update as a starting point (on-going)

OSS

- Look into establishing a NIST-wide structure for handling fees/dues; find out about any issues associated with NIST paying dues
- Investigate the voting process by NIST standards representatives
- Investigate the balloting review issues and guidelines for sharing of information across campus
- Resolve the issue of linkage to SPIRE
- Inquire with ANSI about their budget allocations
- Provide input on NIST view of the economic benefits gained from its standards participation
- Review NTTA impact or role in the fees/dues process
- Research and report on U.S. vs other governments structure relative to paying for work on standards

SAC Members

- Provide input to OSS (Krista) on the Strategic Standards Management framework/plan
- Provide information to OSS (Joan) for the publication of the Success Stories
- Provide suggestions on topics for future discussion

OU Assignments:

- Put standards-related activities on home pages; link to OSS homepage
- Review and update SAMI information